A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: FUNCTIONAL AND PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVES

Bekchanova Khushbaroy Jumanazarovna

Tashkent State Medical University

Teacher, Department of Uzbek and foreign languages No.1

E-mail: xushbaroy@gmail.com

Abstract. Discourse markers are essential elements in spoken and written communication, contributing to coherence, cohesion, and pragmatic meaning. This article presents a comparative analysis of discourse markers in English and Uzbek, focusing on their structural, functional, and semantic properties. The study examines how discourse markers operate in organizing speech, expressing speaker attitude, and managing interaction. The findings reveal that while English discourse markers are often independent lexical units, Uzbek markers are frequently derived from particles, suffixes, and modal expressions. The research highlights both similarities and differences in usage patterns and emphasizes their importance in language teaching, translation, and intercultural communication.

Keywords: *discourse markers, pragmatics, English–Uzbek comparison, cohesion, spoken language, functional linguistics, cross-linguistic analysis*

Аннотация. Дискурсивные маркеры являются важными элементами устной и письменной коммуникации, обеспечивая связность, целостность и прагматическое значение текста. В данной статье представлен сравнительный анализ дискурсивных маркеров в английском и узбекском языках с акцентом на их структурные, функциональные и семантические свойства. Исследование рассматривает, как дискурсивные маркеры функционируют в организации речи, выражении отношения говорящего и управлении взаимодействием. Результаты показывают, что в английском языке дискурсивные маркеры часто выступают как самостоятельные лексические единицы, тогда как в узбекском языке они нередко образуются с помощью частиц, суффиксов и модальных выражений. Исследование выявляет как сходства, так и различия в моделях употребления и подчеркивает их важность для преподавания языков, перевода и межкультурной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: *дискурсивные маркеры, прагматика, англійско-узбекское сравнение, связность, устная речь, функциональная лингвистика, межъязыковой анализ*

Annotatsiya. Diskurs markerlari og‘zaki va yozma muloqotda muhim elementlar bo‘lib, matnning yaxlitligi, bog‘liqligi va pragmatik ma’nosini ta’minlaydi. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi diskurs markerlarining qiyosiy tahlili taqdim etiladi, bunda ularning tuzilaviy, funksional va semantik xususiyatlariga e’tibor qaratiladi. Tadqiqot diskurs markerlarining nutqni tashkil etish, so‘zlovchining munosabatini ifodalash va muloqotni boshqarishdagi rolini ko‘rib chiqadi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ingliz tilida diskurs markerlari ko‘pincha mustaqil leksik birliklar sifatida namoyon bo‘lsa, o‘zbek tilida ular ko‘pincha yuklamalar, qo‘shimchalar va modal ifodalardan hosil bo‘ladi. Tadqiqot qo‘llanishdagi o‘xshashlik va farqlarni yoritib beradi hamda ularning til o‘qitish, tarjima va madaniyatlararo muloqotdagi ahamiyatini ta’kidlaydi.

Kalit so‘zlar: *diskurs markerlari, pragmatika, ingliz–o‘zbek qiyosi, bog‘liqlik, og‘zaki nutq, funksional lingvistika, tillararo tahlil*

Introduction. Discourse markers play a crucial role in structuring communication and guiding interpretation in both spoken and written language. They signal relationships between ideas, indicate speaker intentions, and facilitate interaction between speakers and listeners.

In recent years, discourse analysis has become an important field within linguistics, particularly in understanding how meaning is constructed beyond the sentence level. English and Uzbek, belonging to different typological groups, demonstrate distinct strategies in the use of discourse markers. This article aims to explore the similarities and differences in discourse marker usage in English and Uzbek, focusing on their functional and pragmatic roles in communication.

Literature Review. Scholars such as Fraser (1999), Schiffrin (1987), and Blakemore (2002) have extensively studied discourse markers in English, defining them as linguistic elements that connect utterances and reflect speaker intentions. These markers include words such as ***well, so, however, actually, and you know***.

In Uzbek linguistics, discourse markers are often associated with particles ***(-ku, -da, -mi)***, modal words ***(balki, albatta),*** and introductory expressions (***demak, xullas***). Researchers note that Uzbek relies more on morphological and pragmatic cues rather than fixed lexical markers.

Cross-linguistic studies suggest that while discourse markers are universal in function, their forms and distributions vary significantly across languages.

Methodology. This study employs a qualitative comparative approach. Data are drawn from spoken dialogues, literary texts, and language corpora in both English and Uzbek.

The analysis focuses on:

• functional roles (contrast, addition, conclusion),
• pragmatic meanings (hesitation, emphasis, politeness),
• structural forms (lexical vs morphological markers),
• frequency and distribution in discourse.

Analysis and Discussion. Functional Classification of Discourse Markers

In English, discourse markers are often classified according to their function:

• **Addition:** and, also, moreover
• **Contrast:** but, however, on the other hand
• **Result:** so, therefore, thus
• **Topic shift:** by the way, anyway

Uzbek uses similar functional categories:

• **Addition:** *va, yana*
• **Contrast:** *lekin, ammo*
• **Result:** shuning uchun, demak
• **Topic shift:** aytgancha, xullas

Both languages use discourse markers to ensure coherence and logical flow in communication.

Structural Differences

English discourse markers are typically independent words or phrases:

- Well, I think we should start.
- So, what do you mean?

Uzbek discourse markers may appear as:

1. Independent words: “ - Demak, boshlaymiz ”.
2. Particles attached to words: “ - Sen ham kelasanku ”.

“- Bu to‘g‘ri-ku”.

3. Modal expressions:

“- Balki u kelar “.

This demonstrates the agglutinative nature of Uzbek, where discourse meaning is often encoded morphologically.

Pragmatic Functions

Discourse markers serve important pragmatic roles in both languages:

✓ Hesitation / planning:

English: ***well, um***
Uzbek: ***ee, xo‘sh***

- ✓ Emphasis:
  English: ***actually, indeed***
  Uzbek: ***albatta, axir***
- ✓ Politeness / softening:
  English: ***perhaps, I think***
  Uzbek: ***balki, menimcha***

Uzbek often uses particles like “-da” and “-ku” to express subtle pragmatic nuances that are difficult to translate directly into English.

Position in Sentence

English discourse markers are flexible but often appear at the beginning of sentences:

- Well, I agree.

Uzbek markers can appear in various positions:

- Demak, bu muhim. (initial)
- Bu, albatta, muhim. (medial)
- Bu muhim-da. (final particle)

This positional flexibility reflects differences in syntactic structure and information focus.

Implications for Linguistics and Teaching

Understanding discourse markers is essential in:

Language teaching: learners must understand natural speech patterns.

Translation: markers often require functional rather than literal translation.

Pragmatics: they convey speaker attitude and interactional meaning.

Intercultural communication: misuse can lead to misunderstanding.

Uzbek learners of English may:

• overuse “and” or “so”,
• omit pragmatic markers,
• misinterpret tone or politeness.

Teaching discourse markers explicitly can significantly improve communicative competence.

Conclusion. Discourse markers are vital components of communication that contribute to coherence, cohesion, and pragmatic meaning. The comparison between English and Uzbek reveals both universal functions and language-specific realizations. English relies primarily on lexical discourse markers, while Uzbek utilizes a combination of lexical items, particles, and morphological structures. These differences highlight the importance of typology in understanding discourse organization. Future research may explore corpus-based analysis, spoken discourse variation, or the role of discourse markers in bilingual communication.

References

1. Aliyev, S., & Norboboyeva, S. (2026, March). MYOPIA: PREVALENCE, RISK FACTORS AND PREVENTION STRATEGIES IN MODERN STUDENTS. In CONFERENCE ON GLOBAL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES (Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 134-138).

2. Askaraliyevna, K. M. (2025). Total physical response method: highlighting aural comprehension in language learning. O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari, 366-369.

3. Avezova, A. K. (2025, May). SIMPLE MEDICAL CONVERSATIONS IN UZBEK: A GUIDE FOR BEGINNERS IN HEALTHCARE. In E-Conference platform (Vol. 1, No. 20-may, pp. 45-47).

4. Avezova, A. K. P. Q. (2024). O‘ZBEK TILI TALAFFUZ QOIDALARINI XORIJLIK TALABALARGA O ‘RGATISHDA Q, G ‘, X, U VA SH TOVUSHLARINING AHAMIYATI. Academic research in educational sciences, (1), 407-410.

5. Bobomurodova, G. I. (2024). The role of gender in compound words describing human appearance. Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika – Zarubezhnaya lingvistika i lingvodidaktika – Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics, (2)(4).

6. Isomiddinova, D. (2026). Designing an ESP course for first-year medical students: A needs-based case study and content-oriented approach. European Journal of Pedagogical Initiatives and Educational Practices, 4(1).

7. Isomiddinova Diyora. (2026). LEARNING WITH CORPORA IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS. Ta'limda Raqamli Texnologiyalarni Tadbiq Etishning Zamonaviy Tendensiyalari Va Rivojlanish Omillari, 53(1), 163-165.

8. Israilov J.D. AUTHENTIC MEDICAL TEXTS AS A FOUNDATION FOR DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL ENGLISH COMPETENCE IN MEDICAL EDUCATION . (2025). Global Science Review, 11(1), 279-289.

9. Israilov, J. D. (2025,). The Role of Professionally Oriented Medical Texts in Forming Lexical and Discursive Competence in Medical English. In VII International Mediterranean Scientific Research Congress.–Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Türkiye.–13–15 June (pp. 754-758).

10. JUMANAZAROVNA, B. (2025). USING INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO MEDICAL STUDENTS. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL, 5(3), 18-20.

11. Xushbaroy, B. (2025). Effective strategies for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements, 1(5), 863-867.

12. Kadirova L.U., ПЕРЕВОДЫ ЗАИМСТВОВАННЫХ МЕДИЦИНСКИХ ТЕРМИНОВMODERN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL. , 2024-yil.

13. Kadirova L.U., Prince Kumar Гомеопатия в Индии-популярность, развитие и вызовы // International journal of advanced research in education, technology and management. -pp61-65, 2025-yil. vol4, issue 2,2025.

14. Kakhorova, M., & Maqsudjonov, S. (2025). THE COMMON HEALTHCARE APPROACHES IN THE ERA OF GRECO-ROMAN ANTIQUITY. Journal of Applied Science and Social Science, 1(1), 3-6.

15. Madinabonu, J. (2024). SOCIOLINGUISTIC FACTORS THAT IMPACT THAT STUDENTS'LANGUAGE LEARNING. Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research, 2(11), 94-96.

16. Madinabonu, J. (2025). ENHANCING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING THROUGH MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES: A STUDY OF MALL. EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements, 1(5), 850-858.

17. Muhammedova, O. A., & Hamrayeva, D. (2026). Global tibbiy kommunikatsiyada lotin terminologiyasining standartlashtiruvchi roli. Медицинский журнал молодых ученых, 413–418.

18. Norboboeva, S. A. (2025, May). USING TASK-BASED LEARNING TO TEACH MEDICAL ENGLISH IN INTERNATIONAL CLASSROOMS. In E-Conference platform (Vol. 1, No. 20-may, pp. 208-209).

19. Абдуллаев, М. К., and А. Х. Жураев. "Interfaol o 'qitish metodlari–ijodiy shaxsni tarbiyalash folati." Научно-методические журнал министерства народного образования "Преподавания языка и литературы 7 (2016): 22-23.

20. Rakhmatova, N. (2025). INNOVATSION METODIK YONDASHUVLAR ASOSIDA TIBBIYOT YO'NALISHIDA TAHSIL OLAYOTGAN TALABALARGA CHET TILINI O'QITISHNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH. Filologiya va pedagogika, 14(18).

21. Rakhmatova, N. (2025). THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) TOOLS ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES. Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences, Philosophy and Culture, 5(12), 79–82.

22. Абдуллаева, Р. М. (2022). Интеграция С Клиническими Дисциплинами В Медицинском Вузе При Обучении Русскому Языку Специальности. Central Asian Journal of Medical and Natural Science, 3(6), 94-97.

23. Абдуллаева, Р. М. (2016). Своеобразие системы образования великобритании. Ученый XXI века, (3-4).

24. Бобомуродова, Г. И. (2025, November). Геймификация как средство повышения учебной мотивации студентов-медиков при изучении английского языка в контексте ESP. Latin American Journal of Education, 5(6).

25. Мухаммедова, О. А., & Солиев, С. Ш. (2025). Составные части и категории медицинских терминов. Медицинский журнал молодых ученых, 340–342.

26. Алибекова Л. Р. " ЖИВОЙ" РУССКИЙ: КАК СДЕЛАТЬ ЗАНЯТИЯ ПО РУССКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ ИНТЕРЕСНЫМИ ДЛЯ СТУДЕНТОВ-МЕДИКОВ //E-Conference platform. – 2025. – Т. 1. – №. 20-may. – С. 24-27.

27. Алибекова Л. Р. ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ КРЫЛАТЫХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЙ В МЕДИЦИНЕ, И ИХ РОЛЬ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫХ КАЧЕСТВ БУДУЩЕГО ВРАЧА //E-Conference platform. – 2025. – Т. 1. – №. 20-may. – С. 28-30.